

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/305,562	06/08/1999	MARVIN A. ORNSTEIN	ORN-3.0-004	2313

3624 7590 03/29/2002

VOLPE AND KOENIG, P.C.
SUITE 400, ONE PENN CENTER
1617 JOHN F. KENNEDY BOULEVARD
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

CAPRON, AARON J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3714

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/305,562

Applicant(s)

ORNSTEIN ET AL.

Examiner

Aaron J. Capron

Art Unit

3714

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication app ars on the cov r sh t with the corr spondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 46-48 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45, 49 and 50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 3714

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged.

Claims 46-48 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention (Group II), there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 6.

Drawings

Drawings have been objected to as being informal. See Notice of Draftsperson Patent Drawing Review (Form PTO 948).

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The Abstract should be shortened to have up to a maximum of 150 words.

Claim Objections

Claim 45 objected to because of the following informalities:

In step (l), the phrase "performed step (b) and (b)" appears incorrect. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 11, 16-18, 38 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Referring to claims 11 and 49, the phrase “converting the weight determined at step (d)” is incorrect because the limitation cannot refer back to itself. It is to the best understanding of the examiner that “(d)” should be “(c).”

Referring to claims 16 and 17, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the selected number.”

Referring to claim 18, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the display.” It is to the best understanding of the examiner that claim 18 should depend on claim 17 and not claim 7.

Referring to claim 38, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “said elevator means.”

Referring to claim 38, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “said voer.” It is to the best understanding of the examiner that “said voer” should be “said cover.”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 3714

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 12-13, 29 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sines et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,165,069; hereafter "Sines") in view of Filiberti (U.S. Patent No. 5,819,901).

Referring to claims 1-3, Sines discloses a betting system that includes an area provided at each player location for receiving chips (121) and the area having weighing means for determining whether the player is participating (Column 11, lines 30-37), but does not disclose the weighing means or using betting chips that have different weight denominations. However, Filiberti discloses using weighing means to distinguish the number of coins of each denomination in a bin (Abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Filiberti's method of determining the number of coins by weight into Sines method of weighing for participation because the game play would be faster and overall, the casino would take in more money.

Accordingly, it is well known in the art that US coins have different weight denominations, have different weights for two different groups of equal money (5 pennies and one nickel or 2 nickels and 1 dime), and have denominations of one, five, twenty-five and one hundred. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate coins into the betting system because coins would

Art Unit: 3714

eliminate the need for casino tellers and hence eliminate a teller from skimming money from the casino.

Referring to claim 4, neither Sines nor Filiberti discloses the chips of one, five, twenty-five and one-hundred monetary units having weights of 10.30, 11.30, 16.7, and 36.8 grams.

Absent such a specific limitation being critical to the invention, the limitation of the weights does not serve to define or to determine patentability. Such admissions are ordinary in the selection process in the course of the design. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use various weights of chips for the purposes of meeting the differentiation of the chips.

Referring to claims 6 and 9, Sines discloses a betting system but does not disclose using an A/D converter. However, Filiberti discloses using an A/D converter coupled to a load cell for determining the weight and the number of coins (Column 4, lines 56-59). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the A/D converter into Sines betting system because the more accurate the signal, the better the casino and patrons are for having an accurate money count.

Referring to claims 7 and 8, Sines discloses a betting system but does not disclose using a table look up means or a memory for storing monetary values. However, Filiberti discloses performing tests on the coins and determine the proper denomination (Column 3, lines 35-40) which would be stored in a table where the controller would be able to gain a count on the coins stored in the memory (Column 4, lines 30-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the table look up means

Art Unit: 3714

in Sines betting system because it is conventional to have databases to store data in a table format.

Claim 12 corresponds in scope to a method set forth for use of the system listed in claims 1-10 and are encompassed by use as set forth in the rejection above.

Referring to claim 13, Sines discloses a method for playing a game but does not disclose transferring values to a remote location through a communication link. However, Filiberti discloses using a communication link to send coin counts to authorized employees for verification (Figure 4; column 5, lines 26-51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the communication link to the method for playing a game because a communication link would limit the amount of theft by dishonest employees.

Claims 29 and 31-32 correspond in scope to a method set forth for use of the structure listed in claims 1-4, 6-9 and 13 and are encompassed by use as set forth in the rejection above.

Claims 5, 10, 30 and 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sines in view of Filiberti further in view of Ornstein et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,788,574; hereafter "Ornstein").

Referring to claims 5 and 10, as shown above, Sines in view of Filiberti show a betting system where weight of the coin can determine the monetary value of the bet in place, but does not disclose having a second area for receiving a side bet. However Ornstein discloses having a second area for receiving a side bet (Abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Ornstein's side

Art Unit: 3714

bet into the table of Sines because games that include side bets would generate more interest among patrons of a casino.

Referring to claim 30, Sines in view of Filiberti shows a betting system that uses the weight of a coin can determine the monetary value of the bet in place, but does not disclose using chips that are the same size. However, Ornstein used chips of the same size that have a color band and a signal to differentiate the difference between two different denominations. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the same size of the chip into the weight because both forms (weight and signal) can be used to differentiate between the value of chips.

Claims 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sines in view of Filiberti in view of Ornstein further in view of Ornstein (U.S. Patent No. 5,718,431; hereafter "Ornstein '431").

Referring to claims 49-50, as shown above Sines in view of Filiberti discloses a betting system that uses weight to determine the amount of the bet, while Ornstein discloses using additional areas for receiving side bets, but none of these references disclose using a marker to keep track of the number of consecutive wins. However, Ornstein '431 discloses using markers to keep track of the number of consecutive wins (Figure 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate using markers into the betting system because a dealer must keep track of the number of games play and the markers would allow for less mistakes.

Art Unit: 3714

Claims 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sines in view of Filiberti further in view of Franchi (U.S. Patent No. 5,770,533).

Claims 33-35, Sines discloses using a betting system, but fails to disclose using an identifying member with a magnetic surface for storing player data and a receiver for reading player data stored in the magnetic surface. However, Franchi discloses using a betting card that has a magnetic strip (Column 2, lines 38-54) to identify the player and a console to read the information off the card (Figure 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the card into the betting system because the casino may offer incentives on the amount of money a player has gambled with at the casino.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 38 and 39 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 42 and 44 of U.S. Patent No. 5,788,574 in view of Sines.

Art Unit: 3714

U.S. Patent No. 5,788,57 discloses the features of the use of a betting unit, but does not disclose using a weighing sensor. However, as shown above, Sines discloses using a weigh cell to determine whether a player is playing a game. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the weigh cell for the betting unit because the betting unit would become more automated and possibly be used without a dealer.

Claims 11, 14-24, 25-28 and 40-45 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 7, 9-13, 15, 17, 19, 22, 23, 25 and 28 of Ornstein et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,788,574; hereafter "Ornstein") in view of Sines in further view of Filiberti.

Referring to claims 11, 14-18 and 40-45, Ornstein discloses a method for incorporating one or more bets for a game of chance, but does not disclose using weight of the chip at a certain spot and converting the weight to a monetary value. However, as shown above, Sines in view of Filiberti discloses determining the weight of the chip wagered and converting the weight determined to a monetary value. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the weighing means into the game of chance because by weighing the chips to determine the value would speed the game since the dealer does not have to examine the chips.

Referring to claim 19 and 21-23, as shown above, Ornstein discloses a betting system but does not disclose using a table look up means or a memory for storing monetary values of money. However, Filiberti discloses performing tests on the coins and determine the proper

Art Unit: 3714

denomination which would be stored in a table where the controller would be able to gain a count on the coins (and the total money) stored in the memory. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the table look up means in Ornstein's betting system because the use of memory would allow authorized personnel to review the games for tampering.

Referring to claim 20 and 24, Ornstein discloses a betting system but does not disclose using an A/D converter. However, Filiberti discloses using an A/D converter coupled to a load cell for determining the weight and the number of coins. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the A/D converter into Ornstein's betting system because the more accurate the signal, the better the casino and patrons are for having an accurate money count.

Referring to claims 25-28, Ornstein discloses a method for incorporating one or more bets for a game of chance, but does not disclose using weight of the chip at a certain spots and converting the weight to a monetary value. However, as shown above, Sines in view of Filiberti discloses determining the weight of the chips wagered and converting the weight determined to a monetary value. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the weighing means into the game of chance because by weighing the chips to determine the value would speed the game since the dealer does not have to examine the chips.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 3714


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron J. Capron whose telephone number is (703) 305-3520.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jessica Harrison can be reached on (703) 308-2217. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-9302 for regular communications and (703) 746-9303 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

AJC
March 20, 2002



JESSICA HARRISON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Application/Control Number: 09/305,562

Art Unit: 3714

Page 12